



PHILIP D. MURPHY  
Governor

TAHESHA L. WAY  
Lt. Governor

State of New Jersey  
DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY  
DIVISION OF LAW  
25 MARKET STREET  
PO BOX 112  
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0112

MATTHEW J. PLATKIN  
Attorney General  
MICHAEL T.G. LONG  
Director

July 17, 2024

**VIA ECF**

United States District Court  
Clarkson S. Fisher Building  
402 East State Street  
Trenton, New Jersey 08608

Re: *Association of New Jersey Rifle & Pistol Clubs, Inc., et al. v. Platkin, et al.* ("ANJRPC"), No. 3:18-cv-10507; *Cheeseman, et al. v. Platkin, et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-04360; *Ellman, et al. v. Platkin, et al.*, No. 3:22-cv-04397

Dear Judge:

The State writes regarding the Third Circuit's decision in *Delaware State Sportsmen's Association, Inc., v. Delaware*, -- F.4th --, 2024 WL 3406290 (3d Cir. July 15, 2024). The Court affirmed denial of a preliminary injunction in a challenge to Delaware's assault weapons and large capacity magazine (LCM) restrictions, reasoning that the challengers failed to satisfy the equitable factors for injunctive relief. *Id.* at \*5-8. But as relevant to this Court at summary judgment, Judge Roth issued a concurrence on the merits. *Id.* at \*9.

Judge Roth explains that the challenge fails on *Bruen*'s first step because assault weapons and LCMs are not "protected by the Second Amendment." *Id.* Initially, Judge Roth explains that "'bearable arms' are those that are commonly used for self-defense," and the common-use inquiry "hinges on more than [a weapon's] popularity." *Id.* at \*12-13. She adds that "a weapon is in common use for self-defense if evidence shows it is (1) well adapted for self-defense and (2) widely possessed and employed for self-defense." *Id.* at \*13. LCMs and assault weapons do not meet those criteria, and instead are "dangerous and unusual weapons" outside of Second Amendment protections. *Id.* at \*14. Judge Roth adds that the court was not "bound" by *ANJRPC v. Att'y Gen New Jersey*, 910 F.3d 106, 116 (3d Cir. 2018), which pre-dated *Bruen*'s



July 17, 2024

Page 2

clarification “that only weapons in common use today for self-defense, as opposed to generally lawful purposes, are protected by the Second Amendment.” *Id.* at \*16 (citation omitted). Moreover, Judge Roth explains that even if the laws regulating these instruments implicated the Second Amendment, they cannot succeed on step two of *Bruen* because the restrictions at issue “are consistent with the nation’s historical tradition of firearm regulation.” *Id.* at \*17.

Judge Roth’s opinion is a full endorsement of the State’s position. And it undermines Plaintiffs’ position that a weapon need only be commonly owned to achieve protection. *See* Dkt. 175-7 at 21-22, 28. This court should join the chorus of judicial opinions upholding the constitutionality of restrictions on assault weapons and large capacity magazines. *See* Dkt. 203 at 2-3.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW J. PLATKIN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY

By: /s/ Daniel M. Vannella  
Daniel M. Vannella  
Assistant Attorney General

cc: All counsel of record (via ECF)